



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/583,259	06/16/2006	Per Magnusson	4208-33	9081
23117	7590	09/03/2008	EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203			OBAYANJU, OMONIYI	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	4163			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
09/03/2008	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/583,259	MAGNUSSON ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	OMONIYI A. OBAYANJU	4163

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 June 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 24-46 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 24-46 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 16 June 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>06/16/2006</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: The specification is objected to for including claim numbers in the description, e.g. Pg. 4, lines 24-25. Note the claim numbers should not be included in the specification since such numbers are subject to change during prosecution. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 24-26, 28, 29, 32, 33, 35-37, 39, 40, 43, 44 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Argence et al (International Publication No. WO 02104054) in view of O'Neill et al (US Patent No. 5987099).

3. As to claims 24, 35, and 46, D'Argence teaches a method for managing radio resources for providing wireless access to a communication system to a number of terminals, wherein the communication system comprises a first access network using a first access technology and at least one second access network using at least one second access technology different from the first access technology (pg. 1, lines 8-17), wherein the method comprises the steps of: receiving access relevant information (pg.

4, lines 1-11) from the first access network and the at least one second access network (fig. 5 and pg. 15 lines 22-24), comparing the received access relevant information extracted from messages sent within the first access network to access relevant information received from the at least one second access network (pg. 17, lines 4-15); and determining which access network a terminal should access based on at least the comparison of the received access relevant information extracted from messages sent within the first access network to the access relevant information received from the at least one second access network (pg. 17, lines 14-18). Also, discloses a selection manager (fig. 1, CRRM #18). However, D'Argence fails to teach extracting access relevant information by sniffing messages sent within the first access network. O'Neill teaches sniffing messages in a wireless community data which indicates information such as Received signal strength level (RSSI). (col. 14, lines 5-20). Also discloses a listening agent (fig. 11, Cell Manager 1, Arbiter master, and col. 14, lines 60-65). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to combine the teachings of D'Argence with the method of sniffing information in O'Neill's system to achieve the goal of removing only the desired configuration information from a packet in a communication system.

4. As to claims 25 and 36, D'Argence teaches wherein the first access network is a wireless local area network (pg. 3, lines 11-13).

5. As to claims 26 and 37, D'Argence teaches wherein at least part of the messages sent within the first access network (fig. 1, #6) are messages sent between access points (fig. 1, #10) and (pg. 7, lines 8-11).

6. As to claim 28 and 39, D'Argence teaches wherein the extracted access relevant information comprises an identification of a terminal and an identification of an access point that the terminal has associated with (pg. 19, lines 4-10).

7. As to claims 29 and 40, D'Argence teaches wherein at least part of the access relevant information is extracted by sniffing user plane traffic for at least one terminal (pg. 13, lines 24-29), which access relevant information is used to calculate traffic volume and/or throughput of the at least one terminal (pg. 19, lines 1-3).

8. As to claims 32 and 43, D'Argence teaches wherein at least part of the messages sent within the first access network are sent between at least one terminal and an access point (pg. 1, lines 1-7).

9. As to claims 33 and 44, D'Argence teaches wherein at least part of the access relevant information extracted by sniffing messages sent within the first access network indicates how frequently a channel was busy, which indicates a load of the channel (pg. 4, lines 10-11).

10. Claims 27 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Argence et al (International Publication No. WO 02104054) in view of O'Neill et al (US Patent No. 5987099) and further in view of Lee et al (US Patent No. 6657981).

11. As to claims 27 and 38, D'Argence and O'Neill teaches the limitations of claim 26 and 37 as discussed above. However they both fail to teach defining the message by the Inter-Access Point Protocol (IAPP). Lee teaches an (IAPP) manager used to transfer handover information between access points in a communication network (fig.

5). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to combine the teachings of D'Argence and O'Neill with the teachings of Lee to achieve the goal of efficiently and accurately transferring information within access points in a wireless communication system.

12. Claims 30 and 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Argence et al (International Publication No. WO 02104054) in view of O'Neill et al (US Patent No. 5987099) and further in view of Nikkelen (US Publication No. 20030207688).

13. As to claims 30 and 41, D'Argence and O'Neill teaches the limitations of claim 24 and 35 as discussed above. However they both fail to teach wherein at least part of the messages sent within the first access network are sent between access points and a router. Nikkelen teaches a core network node used to communicate from the core network through the first type of mobile radio system which includes a radio access network and a base station (fig. 2, #20 and #26). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to combine the teachings of D'Argence and O'Neill with the teachings of Nikkelen to achieve a perfect link to transfer data between components of a wireless communication system.

14. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Argence et al (International Publication No. WO 02104054) in view of O'Neill et al (US

Patent No. 5987099) and further in view of Brahmbhatt et al (US Publication No. 20060116170).

15. As to claim 31, D'Argence and O'Neill teaches the limitations of claim 24 as discussed above. However they both fail to teach defining the message by the Light Weight Access Point Protocol (LWAPP). Brahmbhatt teaches using (LWAPP) specification may determine which access point to associate with, also the messages includes a network ID(pg. 6, pp0052, lines 1-6). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to combine the teachings of D'Argence and O'Neill with the teachings of Brahmbhatt to achieve the goal of efficiently and accurately transferring information within access points in a wireless communication system.

16. Claims 34 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Argence et al (International Publication No. WO 02104054) in view of O'Neill et al (US Patent No. 5987099) and further in view of Ramos et al (US Publication No. 20040053630).

17. As to claims 34 and 45, D'Argence and O'Neill teaches the limitations of claim 24 and 35 as discussed above. However they both fail to teach converting the received access relevant information extracted by sniffing messages sent within the first access network and/or the access relevant information received from the at least one second access network to comparable quantities. Ramos teaches using a common language for signaling, handover algorithms, and harmonized load indicators in a different radio

access system (pg. 2, pp0036). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to combine the teachings of D'Argence and O'Neill with the teachings of Ramos to achieve a common ground for manipulating information from different wireless communication network.

18. Claim 42 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over D'Argence et al (International Publication No. WO 02104054) in view of O'Neill et al (US Patent No. 5987099) and Nikkelen (US Publication No. 20030207688), and further in view of Brahmbhatt et al (US Publication No. 20060116170).

19. As to claim 42, D'Argence, O'Neill, and Nikkelen teaches the limitations of claim 41 as discussed above. However they fail to teach defining the message by the Light Weight Access Point Protocol (LWAPP). Brahmbhatt teaches using (LWAPP) specification may determine which access point to associate with, also the messages includes a network ID(pg. 6, pp0052, lines 1-6). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at time the invention was made to combine the teachings of D'Argence, O'Neill, and Nikkelen with the teachings of Brahmbhatt to achieve the goal of efficiently and accurately transferring information within access points in a wireless communication system.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OMONIYI A. OBAYANJU whose telephone number is (571)270-5885. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 7:30 - 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mark Robinson can be reached on 571-272-2319. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/O. A. O./
Examiner, Art Unit 4163

/Mark A. Robinson/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4163